White Flag of the Halo - Commentary on ps4fan 3310 AKA Halofan hp00

0 - Mickey Views (Himself; April 16, 2018)

1 - DAN STEIN (Himself; April 23, 2018)

2 - ps4fan 3310 (Master Chief; May 6, 2018)

3 - DAN STEIN (Himself; May 7, 2018)

4 - ps4fan 3310 (Master Chief; May 13, 2018)

5 - DAN STEIN (Himself; May 17, 2018)

6 - ps4fan 3310 (Master Chief; May 18, 2018)

7 - Doodletones (Minecraft Footage; May 21, 2018)

8 - ps4fan 3310 (Master Chief; May 21, 2018)

9 - Blazing Larvesta (Larvesta; Present)

Script Proofread by:

MegatronDBZ

Bowserdude X

Duel Taku

Hoo boy, have I gotten myself into quite the pickle this time… So, for those of you who have been been in the CC for a while now, you may be familiar with a former troll commentator called ps4fan 3310, more commonly known as Halofan. Like I said, he was once a troll commentator back in 2015, but starting about last year, he has started to become a genuine commentator. So, anyways, context. Back in April, a news channel called Mickey Views did a video on a supposed overhaul on the Disney theme park Tomorrowland, among other recent Disneyland events, and a kid named Dan Stein did a commentary on that, which Halofan did a commentary on. Dan and Halo had their back and forth for six degrees until a commentator called Doodletones stepped in and did a commentary on the entire chain up to that point. While Dan has yet to respond to Doodle's video, as far as I'm aware, Halofan, on the other hand, rushed out a commentary on Doodle's video, and posted it not even a few hours after Doodle's video came out, which is where I step into this mess of a chain at Degree 9. Now, before we begin, I am aware Halofan has since deleted the video from his channel, as well as shown regret in making said video, however, to my knowledge, nobody else appears to have covered this video, so no one has pointed out the problems with it, and even then, from what I've seen of Halofan after this video, most of his later videos aren't much better, to be honest, so I'd still say it's fair game, despite being completely disowned. Anyways, that's all for the explanation, so let's get into the commentary. Time to ignite my flames!

Intro

[0:00 - 0:08]

scoff Assuming you aren't already a really huge punching bag to begin with? Okay, in all seriousness, though, if you're really that worried about your commentary "turning you into a big punching bag", as you put it, you could just not make the video in the first place. Sometimes, backing out and admitting defeat is the best option to avoid further conflict. Then again, that's assuming that you don't already ~~do this quite a bit~~ raise quite a fair number of white flags throughout this entire video…

[0:08 - 0:20]

Well, okay then, That7thBloodyDragon.

[0:28 - 0:42]

Don't you just love it when people take their targets out of context to bring up issues that have already been resolved in past degrees? Because I don't, that's for sure. (Plays 1:34 - 2:08 of Degree 7) Whoa, would you look at that, an answer to your question in the very video you're covering! Doodletones had already addressed the point about leaving Dan alone in her previous commentary on you. As she explained with her skirmish with Dan back in 2016, Dan Stein is not the kind of person who will keep on pestering people if they ignore him, so, yes, Halo, Doodle does think you should leave Dan Stein alone, and honestly, given her example, so do I.

[0:42 - 1:35]

And the point of this is… what? Like, how does Dan nitpicking your videos invalidate his point, or Doodle's point for that matter? Doodletones didn't even deny that Dan was nitpicking, but was simply stating that you calling Dan out for nitpicking didn't debunk his point, so… why is this point even here?

Hey, Post-Larvesta here to bring up a possible meaning to Halofan's point here. After I got done scripting my commentary, it had occurred to me that Halofan could have meant to use his "Dan was nitpicking" point to debunk Dan's video, in which case, Halo, don't bother trying to say that, as that still doesn't debunk Dan's point. If anything, that would just make your point even worse, as then you'd just be using hypocrisy to try and debunk Dan's video, which is a type of ad hominem attack called a Tu Quoque. Now, I'm not saying for certain that you did intend to use your point in that manner, but regardless, you left the possibility there. Please be more careful, next time.

[1:35 - 1:49]

Oh, okay, so basically, what you're telling Doodletones is: "Hey, I know my point is invalid, but I made it invalid on purpose, so ha!" Like, seriously, if you're literally just going to raise a white flag here and flat out admit your point is wrong, why bother interjecting here in the first place? On top of that, you got the context of your 4th degree point here wrong. Your point back in that video was you accusing Dan of calling you a nitpicking douchebag, yet here, you're saying that you were the one calling him a nitpicking douchebag, which is straight up incorrect, and also really baffling, considering you had played the very clip where you made your accusation in your own video.

[(Degree 7) 3:06 - 3:16 (While Degree 7 is playing, text that reads: "Note: Halofan cut out this portion of the chain in his video. I'm playing this clip here to provide context for the following point.")] then [1:56 - 2:14]

Sorry, Flame Hyenard, but repeating your points from previous degrees without elaborating on them doesn't make them valid. I could keep saying stuff like "grass is red," "a minute is 30 seconds," or "The Stanley Parable is a competently made game with any worth," over and over again, but that on its own won't make any of my points correct. Like, seriously, how could anybody like that boring slog of a video game, my god...

[2:14 - 3:33] (2:41 - 3:23 is sped up)

(At 2:44, Larvesta appears for a bit and shows a speech bubble saying: "Oh, don't worry, I'm still here. This context just goes on for quite a bit, so bear with me.")

Okay, there's quite a bit to go over in this instance.

First of all, to go back and hit your 6th degree video, please learn what a retake is. I know this is a rather minor issue that doesn't completely destroy your video, but having stuff like this where you wind up messing up words in your video, and having to repeat them comes off as somewhat unprofessional and lazy on your end.

Second of all, to address your most recent video in this chain, no, Halofan, Doodletones is correct here, your argument back in your 6th degree video does not ~~address or~~ debunk Dan's point, as back there, you just complain about Dan getting onto your case for showing your face in your first intro without really elaborating on why this is an issue. Had you gone into detail on why Dan complaining about you showing your face was an issue, your point actually could have had some ground to stand on, but no, you just said he was complaining about your intro with no substance.

Finally, third of all, how does the fact that your "I want to kill myself right now, but I can't" line was a joke address Doodle's video? Are you trying to say that Doodle took your joke too seriously? Doodle didn't even address that part aside from her "Why are people aggressive towards Halofan, again?" statement, which wasn't even part of the actual point she made towards you, but was instead a mere side note about how destructive some of your detractors were, so, no Halo, she's not really taking your joke all that seriously.

[3:40 - 3:49]

Okay, this is a thing that's been bothering me for quite a while, so now I'm going to bring it up. Throughout this video, there's quite a few instances where Halofan leaves a second or two of superfluous footage that has nothing to do with his interjections, such as here where he leaves in part of Doodle's point clarifying Halo's hypocrisy point to Dan, only for Halo to talk about a later point about not showing a clip from one of his sources. I'll admit, at the end of the day, this point is rather nitpicky, but Halo, it would make your video look somewhat better if you were to not leave in these extra frames, so do try to work on that if you get a chance.

[(Degree 7) 5:45 - 5:57 (While Degree 7 is playing, text that reads: "Note: Halofan again cut out this portion of the chain in his video. I'm again playing this clip here to provide context for the following point, and I'll address this problem soon.")] then [3:45 - 4:24]

Again with the white flag points!? How does you being lazy excuse the fact that you failed to provide context for where SuperCharmander1 made his "hypocrisy comes with surprise" line? Besides, just because there's a reason you didn't show context, that doesn't excuse the fact that you failed to show context. In other words, SHOW. YOUR. RE. SEARCH. next time.

[4:34 - 5:15]

Hold it! clip plays Halofan, could you please let Doodle finish her point before butting in? (Play 10:26 - 10:59 of Degree 7) I noticed that there are quite a number of instances throughout this video where you only play a portion of the entire degree instead of playing the entire context to your point, resulting in you taking your target out of context, which honestly comes off as really shady on your end, regardless if that was your intent or not. For instance, in this interjection, Doodle was explaining ~~in this interjection~~ how your potshot towards Dan came off as needlessly spiteful, given that you basically called his video cancer, and said that you weren't trying to help Dan, giving off the impression that you just wanted to make this video to be destructive towards him. Also, how in the world was Doodletones supposed to know that your statement was meant to be just a harmless joke? Your tone and wording back in that statement does a horrendous job conveying your intentions, so if I were in Doodle's scenario, I honestly would have wound up making the same assumption she made.

[5:15 - 5:27]

And there's no clip playing, so thus you leave your audience having to do your legwork for you, which is really aggravating, given that it's really hard to make out who you said you got your reference from because of your mumbling! Hey, am I experiencing Deja vu? Okay, to add onto this point, how does the fact that you got your statement from another YouTuber excuse how spiteful you came off in this part of the video? For all we know, whoever you got your line from could have also gotten called out for sounding destructive, just like what Doodle called you out for here.

[5:39 - 6:04]

Okay, there's quite a few things wrong here. First off, you once again interrupted Doodle before she could finish. (Play 12:52 - 13:23 of Degree 7). Doodle was explaining the definition of jarring, and bringing up how Dan's 1st degree video wasn't jarring, given that it was him using camera footage on another person using camera footage. You saying that Dan should use an avatar in his video would only serve to make his video even more jarring. Secondly, way to repeat the exact same mistake Dan made in his videos on you. Just like Doodle said, Dan is free to use camera footage if he wants, just as you and I are free to use video game characters as avatars. Please don't get onto Dan's case for this, I really don't feel like playing a hypocrisy media clip right now.

[(Degree 7) 13:23 - 13:55]

Okay, Doodle, I'm supposed to be defending you here, please don't open up old wounds, thank you very much.

[6:04 - 6:35]

First off, what point are you even talking about? The footage you show in this interjection does not specify which point Dan was constantly repeating, given that you cut out Dan's part of the chain, leaving viewers completely lost on what exactly is going on in this part of the video. (Play 10:23 - 10:58 of Degree 6) Not to mention, another bit of context you forgot to bring up was where else Dan was repeating his point, as that could have proved that Dan didn't just repeat his point once, but in fact said it over and over and over again. Shame you couldn't in this particular instance, though, as Dan really was only complaining about your pronunciation of his name once in his 3rd Degree video, and later on in his 5th Degree video. Fun fact, most people don't consider saying a point twice to be "drilling a point into someone's head".

[6:35 - 7:15]

Yeah, I'm just going to redirect my viewers back to my white flag and no context points again, as I am not repeating myself over and over again.

With that, Halofan just ends the video, stating that he thought Doodle's video was good overall aside from the points he brought up, and then worries some more about how his commentary is going to turn him into a punching bag. Nothing really worth bringing up, so time for final thoughts.

Final Thoughts

Halofan, real talk, what in the world were you trying to accomplish with this video? This video honestly feels like you just lazily put together this commentary just for the sake of making a commentary to defend yourself instead of owning up to your mistakes, which I should know is an absolutely horrible idea given the miserable reception my commentary on Phantom N got. Even if that wasn't your intention, though, on its own merits, this video is still really hot garbage, and to me at least, stands as one of the absolute worst commentaries to come out this year. Throughout this video, you took Doodle out of context, made up excuses instead of trying to debunk her video, made interjections that were already proven blatantly wrong by past degrees, including parts you showed in this very video, and outright admitted defeat in some of your interjections. Next time, I'd suggest putting a bit more effort into your videos, as well as having other people look over your script to make sure your points actually work against what your target is saying, else you'll just wind up with even more videos like the one I covered today. Now, despite me coming off as potentially really aggressive in certain parts of the video, I do genuinely wish the best for you in terms of content, and I am aware that you have since apologized for this video, so there is that, but if what I've been hearing about your more recent videos like your recent one on Marcus Yamamoto are any indicator, you don't seem to have improved much since this video. Anyways, this has been Blazing Larvesta, and best of luck with your future content.